to the new rules. There is no distinction between Revenue Inspectors and clerks.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—When a Revenue Inspector draws his pay, does he not draw it as Revenue Inspector?

Rao Bahadur Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—We have no such Revenue Inspectors now.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—Are there no Revenue Inspectors?

Rao Bahadur Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—There are clerks doing the duties of the Revenue Inspectors. That order was passed in May 1931. We do not make any distinction between clerks and Revenue Inspectors now. The revenue clerks areposted for field work and office work according to requirements and exigencies of service.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—In the budget we see distinction.

Rao Bahadur Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—In the last budget you will not find the word 'Revenue Inspectors'.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—In these cases it is seen that the T. A. was fixed on 1st Kanni 1097. In all the other cases a reduction was effected subsequent to that. What is the reason for allowing the T. A. of these alone to remain as it is?

Rao Bahadur Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—Because it is considered to be adequate. No change was considered necessary.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—Have not the clerks doing the Revenue Inspectors' work to travel and inspect more than 10 villages?

Rao Bahadur Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—Only wihin a limited radius. They can exchange the consolidated allowance for the ordinary T. A. when they have to go beyond their jurisdiction.

Mr. K. Ayyappan.—Were there Revenue Inspectors' posts at any time here?

Rao Bahadur Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—Yes, before the new rule was introduced in 1931. We had a special cadre of Revenue Inspectors up to 1106.

Mr. K. Ayyappan.—Why were these posts abolished?

President.—I do not think that question arises.

Notification by Comptroller of Accounts.

323. **Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.**—Will the Government be pleased to state:—

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

(a) whether notification of the Comptroller of Accounts dated 4th October 1911 and published at page 64 of the Cochin Government Gazette dated 21st Kanni 1087 is still in force;

(b) will a copy of the notification be placed on the Council table?

Mr. P. V. Subramania Ayyar.—(a) Yes.

(b) A copy of the notification is appended. (*Appendix IX.*)

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—Sir, I request that this may be clubbed with the next question so that the question may be better understood.

President.—Yes.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—It is said that the subjects for the State Account Test are, C. S. R., Account Code Vol. I and II and account portions of P. W. D., Forest, and Tramway Codes. In answer to a previous question in this meeting itself, it is stated that there is a subsequent Proceedings of the Government that those who have passed the Madras Account Test need not pass the State Account Test which comprises all these subjects. So, am I to understand that both these Proceedings, namely, the one printed as appendix 9 and the other which says that they need not pass any of these tests are in force, the one contradicting the other?

Mr. P. V. Subramania Ayyar.—There is no contradiction here. The notification says that those who have passed the Madras Account Test need not pass the Cochin Account Test.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—As far as this appendix is concerned, there is no contradiction. But it refers only to Vol. I, which forms only one of the subjects of the State Account Test. It is said that there is another Proceedings that they need not pass any of the subjects.

Mr. P. V. Subramania Ayyar.—The subsequent Proceedings supersedes this order.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—So this answer is wrong?

Mr. P. V. Subramania Ayyar.—This answer might have been given earlier than that Proceedings.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—That Proceedings is of last year, Sir. Sir, I shall pursue with further fresh questions so that the time of the House need not be wasted.

The British and the Cochin Account tests' comparative value.

324. **Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.**—Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) what are the subjects for the Cochin Account Test Examination;

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

APPENDIX IX.

(Vide answer to Question No. 323)

Notification.

The Diwan has been pleased to order in his Proceedings, dated 30th September 1911, Ref. on C. No. 68 of 1087, Local and Legislative Department (Education), that those who have passed the Madras 'Account Test Lower' need not pass the Cochin Account Test in Account Code. Vol. I.

Comptroller's Office,
Trichur,
4th October 1911.

K. SANGU WARRIAR,
Comptroller of Accounts.

APPENDIX X.

(Vide answer to Question No. 330.)

Petition from M. R. Thulasi Das.

I beg to bring the following few facts to your kind notice for sympathetic reconsideration and favourable orders.

1. I have been a permanent teacher of Class III B of the L. M. C., Convent, M. G., School at Chathiath for the last 10 years, during which period I have given entire satisfaction to the Manager and the authorities concerned. On 18th Edavam 1106, *i. e.*, on the 1st working day of this school year, I was asked by the Manager to put in my resignation and on my politely refusing to do so, I have been relieved from the school. Failing to understand what the provocation was which caused such a treatment, against the explicit order of the Director of Public Instruction contained in his circular Dis. No. 30/R/1102, dated 22nd November 1926, I put in a petition on 23rd Edavam 1106 before you praying for reinstatement. Having not been favoured with a reply I again submitted a petition to which also no reply was received. Another petition was subsequently submitted, but the same was received back by me with the following endorsement. P. No. 14/1107 from the Inspectress of Schools "Orders have been already issued that the department cannot interfere in the matter of his relief as he has been exempted from training on the ground that his post is temporary.

2. From the above order it would appear (1) that an order had already been issued to me in the matter (2) that the same was to the effect that the department could not interfere since I was only a temporary hand. Both these I beg to submit, are against facts. First of all, no order had been issued to me as stated in the endorsement order. Secondly, I was not a temporary or acting hand, which fact will be clear from what I submit below.

3, It was as soon as the school was started that I was appointed there. Prior to that I was a permanently licensed teacher and it was at the Manager's special desire that I joined the service of the said school, since she was in urgent need of an experienced and capable hand who could look after the correspondence work of the school as well. Further the post I was appointed was a permanent one and there was nothing to show that it was not so. My service book, applications for increments continuously for five years and the staff lists of the various years will prove beyond doubt that I was a permanent hand, and that the present plea put in by the Manager that I am only a temporary hand is nothing but a clear stratagem found out by the Manager for the occasion. If, as it is alleged, I was only a temporary hand I would not have received the annual increments. and my service book main-

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly